DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 414 863 HE 030 861

AUTHOR	Guzzetta, D. J.
TITLE	Teaching/Research: Faculty Roles, Evaluations, and Rewards in Kansas Regents Universities. A Case Study.
INSTITUTION	Emporia State Univ., KS. Jones Inst. for Educational Excellence.
PUB DATE	1995-00-00
NOTE	49p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Jones Institute for Educational Excellence; The Teachers College, Emporia State University, Emporia, KS 66801-5087.
PUB TYPE	Information Analyses (070) -- Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Case Studies; *College Faculty; Evaluation Methods; Evaluation Needs; Excellence in Education; Faculty College Relationship; *Faculty Evaluation; Faculty Promotion; Faculty Publishing; Faculty Workload; Higher Education; *Instructional Effectiveness; Noninstructional Responsibility; Recognition (Achievement); *Research; *Rewards; Scholarship; State Universities; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Evaluation; *Teacher Role; Teaching Skills
IDENTIFIERS	*Kansas Regents Universities

ABSTRACT

The faculty roles of teaching and research, and the evaluation and reward of faculty performance, were assessed in a study conducted at the six Kansas Regents universities. The case study research involved interviews with 40 faculty members that focused on faculty performance evaluation policies and practices, and appropriate faculty recognition and rewards resulting from these procedures. Reviews of the literature had revealed that, in practice, excellence in research commands greater recognition and rewards than excellence in teaching. Findings of the faculty interviews reaffirmed the importance of teaching. The study also noted that: (1) the majority of the faculty studied had become professors primarily to teach, although research and service demands frequently steered their energies away from teaching; (2) that faculty appears to have an excellent sense of what good teaching is, especially as it ties into student learning; (3) there were differences among institutional missions, subject matter disciplines, and competencies of the professoriate; and (4) support was expressed for flexibility and multiple models for evaluating faculty performance and broadening of the definition of research and scholarship, particularly as it relates to the teaching and learning process. Seven recommendations to the Kansas Regents universities were proposed. (Contains 75 references.) (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

HE

JONES INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL EXCELLENCE

ED 414 863

Teaching/Research: Faculty Roles, Evaluations, and Rewards in Kansas Regents Universities

HE 030 861

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Emporia State Univ

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

D. J. GUZZETTA
JONES DISTINGUISHED UNIVERSITY PROFESSOR 1994-1995

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TEACHING/RESEARCH: FACULTY ROLES, EVALUATIONS, AND REWARDS IN KANSAS REGENTS UNIVERSITIES

A CASE STUDY

by

D. J. GUZZETTA
Jones Distinguished University Professor
Jones Institute for Educational Excellence
The Teachers College
Emporia State University, Emporia, Kansas

1995

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 1

II. INTRODUCTION 5

III. SCOPE, DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY 6

IV. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE 7

V. RESULTS OF THE INTERVIEWS 22

VI. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS 32

VII. BIBLIOGRAPHY 36

VIII. APPENDIX 42

TEACHING/RESEARCH: FACULTY ROLES, EVALUATIONS, AND REWARDS IN KANSAS REGENTS UNIVERSITIES

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In general, faculty performance evaluations are conducted in a similar format across all the Kansas Regents higher education communities. The common missions of higher education institutions--teaching, research, and service--provide the basis upon which the faculty are evaluated annually. The process involves students, peers and/or administrators who participate in judging the faculty's demonstrated performance in each of the above three areas. However, the actual implementation of the process varies among institutions in accordance with the emphases the colleges and /or universities place on their three pronged functions.

The three components are weighted in faculty performance evaluations and the results are considered for appropriate recognition and rewards. Since decisions on faculty promotions, tenure and salary adjustments are often dependent on these prescribed performance assessments, the nature of the evaluation process seems to be under continuous review.

A related issue overriding this practice is the decades old debate on the relative importance of teaching versus research in the performance evaluation process. There appears to be consensus among educators that both activities are vital in higher education, but that they are not given equal consideration in the assessment of the individual successes achieved by the faculty on an annual basis. In any event, the administrative decision makers at the departmental levels and above do not seem to implement the policies in the same manner. A literature search on the issue, which included numerous national surveys and studies, plus a case study conducted among the six Kansas Regents universities revealed that, in practice, excellence in research commands greater recognition and rewards than excellence in teaching. These results clearly place the state of Kansas in the mainstream of U.S. higher education suggesting that national concerns are also concerns within Kansas Regents universities. It should be noted, however, that the Kansas Regents University System is addressing the issues involved. An analysis of forty faculty interviews, reinforced by the literature review, led the author to offer the following conclusions:

- The importance of teaching at all types of institutions was reaffirmed by the faculty from all three professorial ranks: professor, associate professor, and assistant professor.

- The majority of the interviewees became professors primarily to teach, but the research and service demands have frequently steered their energies away from teaching.

- The faculty appears to have an excellent sense of what good teaching is, especially as they tie it into *learning*, the ultimate measurable outcome.

- Ideally, teaching and research should be complementary faculty activities, but realistically, they compete for time and status.

- The faculty spoke to the differences among institutional missions, subject matter disciplines, competencies and interests of the professoriate. They also expressed support for flexibility and multiple models for evaluating faculty performance. In this connection, they did not appear to be overly concerned about creating a two tier faculty set-up through the different evaluation models that could emerge. They observed that a "caste system" already exists among disciplines. However, they advised caution to avoid abuses which could develop with too broad a selection of class models.

- All saw merit in considering a broadening of the definition of research and scholarship and particularly as such activity could relate to the teaching/learning process.

- There was nearly unanimous support for maintaining a high level of continuous scholarly activity directed towards the improvement of instruction.

- The feeling was expressed that the expectation for increased research is growing while the expectation for teaching remains the same.

- There appears to be a tendency for faculty to gravitate towards professional activities where the rewards are the greatest and it is their perception that the rewards are geared to research and publications.

- Regardless of the stated "component weighting" policies extant at the various institutions, the faculty perceives the system to favor research in the final evaluative analysis.

- In discussing actual and perceived policies and practices regarding the awarding of tenure, promotions, and salary adjustments with the faculty interviewees, it became apparent that the faculty and the academic administrators were not always on the same wave length.

A composite analysis of what constitutes an effective teaching/learning environment emerged from these interviews. The faculty stated that effective teaching is demonstrated by those persons who have developed the skill of helping students understand, apply and integrate concepts. Effective teaching also contributes to the creation of a good learning environment where teachers and students interact in a collaborative manner. This is brought about through mastery of the subject matter

and a command and use of a variety of teaching skills. Related and concurrent faculty involvement in such activities as advising, tutoring, mentoring, and assessment are also an integral part of the teaching/learning process.

From the literature review, the case study, and the author's experience, seven recommendations to the Kansas Regents universities are advanced:

1. Require all faculty to maintain a high level of scholarship activity aimed at insuring currency and continuous upgrading of the teaching/learning process.

2. Redefine and broaden the meaning of research to include all types of scholarly activities unique to individual disciplines and recognize and reward such efforts equally. In addition to the traditional research leading to publications, acceptable scholarly activity might include presenting papers at professional meetings, writing academic reports, reviews, novels, poems, plays and musical scores. Also, artistic performances, developing video tapes, designing new courses and computer software, curricular and teaching innovations and exhibitions could be considered scholarly tasks.

3. Accept as "academically respectable" faculty whose preference is primarily teaching and attach equivalent status, prestige, recognition and rewards for successful annual performance evaluations as "teacher/scholars *or* scholar/teachers."

4. Base the recognition and reward system on individual faculty achievements of mutually agreed upon "annual goals contracts."

5. Adopt flexible models of faculty performance evaluations "customized" to the missions and needs of the universities, the different disciplines, and the competencies and preferences of the individual faculty members.

6. Eliminate the faculty's "perceived" gap between stated policies and actual practices regarding performance evaluations at each administrative level of review.

7. Adopt more flexible approaches to institutional expectations and annual evaluations of faculty at different stages of their professional careers. Also, recognize and accept developmental and performance changes that occur with experience and maturation.

The above summary seems to indicate that the faculty interviewed at the six Kansas Regents universities have a good working knowledge of what constitutes effective teaching. It also calls attention to how the various related academic

activities contribute to the enhancement of the teaching/learning environment across the system. Hopefully, the resulting faculty performance evaluation procedures will incorporate all of the ingredients that constitute a higher education setting and properly and equitably reward achievement, especially in teaching.

TEACHING/RESEARCH: FACULTY ROLES, EVALUATIONS, AND REWARDS IN KANSAS REGENTS UNIVERSITIES

II. INTRODUCTION

Few issues in higher education appear to attract more attention than faculty performance evaluations. The methods and procedures used in the process, the professional aspects measured, and the consequences of the results are continually being challenged and queried. A review of the literature in this field reveals a proliferation of studies and analyses dealing with faculty roles being measured and rewarded, especially with reference to the teaching and research components. However, definitive and acceptable answers to the many questions being raised on this issue still seem to elude the higher education establishment.

The author, a senior educator with more than 40 years of teaching/administrative experience in higher education, has had a "life long" personal and professional interest in the above issue. With his appointment as the Jones Distinguished University Professor in the Jones Institute for Educational Excellence at Emporia State University, Emporia, Kansas, the opportunity to explore again the topic of faculty performance evaluations and the recognition and rewards therewith, has emerged. Coincidentally, the Kansas Board of Regents and its six universities have been addressing faculty performance evaluations and teaching/learning in some depth for the past several years. Furthermore, the issue continues to be on its agenda for ongoing attention and review.

Encouraged by the timeliness and interest in this subject by the academic community in the state of Kansas, two joint areas of study were identified: Faculty performance evaluation policies and practices, and appropriate faculty recognition and rewards resulting from these procedures. With cooperation from the staff of the Board of Regents and the individual Regents universities assured, the study was launched. Because of the time constraints associated with the study (one semester), a case study approach was decided upon involving 40 personal interviews with faculty representatives from all six universities.

The six Regents universities in the state of Kansas represent a good cross section of higher education institutions. Therefore, it seemed that a case study of faculty evaluation activity and the proper recognition of faculty activities in the process, would be in order. Additionally, as one adds the roles faculties play in the achievement of an institution's mission, a more comprehensive picture of faculty recognition and rewards is presented.

A number of similarly directed studies have been conducted nationally, but reactions and responses were sought primarily from those in key administrative positions such as vice presidents, deans and division/department heads. This study's target audience

was the faculty. A sampling of faculty from all three professorial ranks participated in 45 minute interviews which solicited perceptions of how the performance evaluation process works in respective academic units, how evaluations are implemented and what is considered to be the most significant ingredient in the total "work" activities of the faculty. The role and importance of teaching reported in the process was given special attention and highlighted in the overall "condition" of the professoriate.

III. SCOPE, DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY

Since the founding of Harvard in 1636, the principal reason for the existence of institutions of higher learning has been the enhancement of the teaching/learning process. Although teaching and learning represent the giving and receiving ends of the educational process, in essence they are "two sides of a single coin." It is not possible to have one without the other. In the words of Angelo and Cross (1993) "there is no such thing as effective teaching in the absence of learning. Teaching without learning is just talking." (p. 3) Therefore, a primary aim of higher education should be the improvement of the quality of learning in the classroom through teaching.

Over the last three centuries as higher education developed, universities began to take on additional functions that finally emerged with the collective missions of teaching, research and service. Presumably, institutions assumed roles in each of these areas, but in varying degrees. However, it was understood that teaching would continue to be the focal point of higher education's major thrust. Since one of the two principal people components in a university environment is the faculty (the other being the students), the faculty play a significant role in helping to fulfill the stated missions of the institutions. At the same time, the task of recognizing and rewarding faculty for their professional contributions towards achieving the missions of the universities rested in large part with "the administration." Because of status and prestige, faculty research activities began to become increasingly more important. Therefore, consciously or unconsciously, an expectation of intensified involvement in research activities gained prominence. The end result, particularly at the more "prestigious" universities, was the relegation of teaching to a less rewarded role with service in third place. For purposes of this study, attention will be given primarily to teaching with appropriate references to its strong ally, research.

It is interesting to note that with the increased attention now being given to the importance of teaching, attempts at broadening the definition of research as it might and should relate to teaching are being made. A leading proponent of this move is Ernest Boyer (1992) who, has taken the position that it is time "to break out of the tired old teaching versus research debate and define, in more creative ways, what it means to be a scholar. It's time to recognize the full range of faculty talent and the great diversity of functions higher education must perform." (p. xii) In an earlier publication Boyer (1987) asked: "What is the balance that should be struck between

teaching and research? Is it appropriate for different types of higher learning institutions to have different criteria for faculty evaluation?" (p. 4)

Having been on the "firing line" for several decades as an administrator/faculty member and having been exposed to the above developments from several vantage points, it appeared to the author that a "snap-shot" of where the issue stands among the Kansas Regents universities would be desirable. With the encouragement and support of the Jones Institute for Educational Excellence, the author launched this case study in an attempt to obtain faculty responses to the institutional expectations and rewards for teaching/scholarship/research. Through the personal intensive interviews, faculty input was sought on the collective improvement of the teaching/learning process, as well as an equitable and balanced faculty performance evaluation system.

The Kansas Regents Universities representing research, land grant, urban and regional universities presented an excellent cross section of American higher education. Faculties from the following institutions of higher learning took part in the study: Emporia State University, Fort Hays State University, The University of Kansas, Kansas State University, Pittsburg State University, and Wichita State University. Forty faculty members were identified by the six Regents institutions. These individuals were chosen by the presidents of the institutional faculty senates in conjunction with the offices of the chief academic officers with the stipulation that (1) no more than one would be identified from a discipline, (2) all selectees would have at least three years experience at the institution and that the assistant professors be non-tenured, (3) each one be considered "typical" and/or "average" (4) the selectees not have administrative responsibilities. The distribution included 12 professors, 15 associate professors and 13 assistant professors. The allocation of numbers from each institution was somewhat related to both size and mission. The institutional representatives ranged from five to nine with the larger institutions--those with substantial graduate programs--having greater participation. Additionally, it should be noted that the School of Medicine and the School of Veterinary Science were exempted from the project.

Once faculty were selected, personal interviews took place on the interviewees' respective campuses during April 1995. The same set of open ended questions (Appendix) was asked of each interviewee, and the sessions were tape recorded. The average length of the interviews was 45 minutes. An analysis of their responses followed the completion of the 40 taped interviews. Each tape from the interviews was transcribed and reviewed highlighting pertinent responses to determine common concerns as well as a possible pattern of reactions to the five questions. Individual comments appropriate to the issues raised were extracted and quoted directly in the analysis. The results are reported in Section V.

Interest in the project and the cooperation of each of the campuses was at a high level. Additionally, the respect the six Regents institutions have for each other was

readily apparent. Furthermore, an understanding of the varying missions being performed by the Regents "team of universities" was volunteered and understood by the interviewees.

IV. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

In 1980, the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education issued its final report in a series of topical reports on various educational issues over a time span from 1974-1980. The document was titled *Three Thousand Futures: The Next Twenty Years for Higher Education* referring to the 3000 institutions of higher education in existence at that time. The most recent total identified by *The Chronicle of Higher Education* (1994) lists 3,638 colleges and universities in the United States.

A significant statement made in the above Carnegie Report (1980) follows:

> Each campus has had its own individual recent history, and is likely to have its own individual near future. Institutions of higher education have been riding off in all directions and will probably continue to do so: *3,000 different institutions face 3,000 different futures*. (p. 79)

In many respects, the emphasis on the differences among institutions of higher education is highly desirable. Yet, in actuality, there is a tendency among institutions to be emulators, especially of the more "prestigious" colleges and universities. The procedural and operational commonalities among our 3,638 institutions gives the impression of "cookie cutter end products." If this is so, some analysis of the direction in which higher education has moved needs to be made.

It is a generally accepted position in the United States higher education academic arena that four year colleges and universities have a three fold function, in varying degrees, in the areas of teaching, research and service. For the most part, the public and governmental funding agencies look upon the teaching element to be paramount and a substantial percentage of the professoriate has expressed support for the importance of teaching. As an illustration, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching in 1989 asked nearly 10,000 faculty members a series of questions related to teaching, scholarship and service and obtained 5,450 responses or a 54.5% response rate. In response to a question on the importance of teaching, 62% of the faculty strongly agreed or agreed with reservations that "Teaching effectiveness should be the primary concern for promotion of faculty." (p. 64) On the other hand, practice among many four year colleges and universities has tended to skew the evaluation of faculty professional performance more towards "published research" than teaching or service. This has not always been a conscious effort on the part of the "evaluators," but the end result has shown that such a shift has occurred. In the fall of 1989, The University of California at the Los Angeles Higher Education Research Institute issued "The American College Teacher: National Norms for the 1989-90 H.E.R.I. Faculty Survey," its most recent study on higher

education. A summary of the survey appeared in the September 1, 1994 issue of *The Chronicle of Higher Education Almanac*. Of the 36,478 faculty surveyed at 392 institutions, 55% responded. A number of higher education faculty attitudes and activities, such as professional goals, faculty rewards, student advising, teaching, research, scholarship and outside activities were identified. Of particular significance to the study described in this document were the following represented public universities' responses:

Professional goals noted as 'essential' or 'very important'
97.6% of faculty selected "Be a good teacher"

Attributes noted as 'very descriptive' of own institution
1.3% of faculty listed "Faculty rewarded for advising skills"
6.2% of faculty said "Faculty rewarded for being good teachers"

'Agree strongly' or 'somewhat' that at own institution
44.4% of faculty replied "Institutional demands for doing research interfere with effectiveness as a teacher"

Issues noted as being of 'highest' or 'high priority' at own institution
80.5% of faculty responded "Conducting basic and applied research"

A careful review of the survey revealed that the issue of faculty roles, recognition and rewards at higher education institutions needs to be revisited with the intent of bringing stated policies and practices closer together. It seems that the research function is more clearly understood because it is quantifiable. However, the determination of the effectiveness of the teaching function is less clear and its quality lacks adequate measurement "tools." Stephen Jordan, (1994) Executive Director of the Kansas Board of Regents, has written that "some universities are engaging in a redefinition of teaching that incorporates classroom performance, assessment of student work, supervision of graduate students and course preparation and advising." (p. 20) The area of research/scholarship is also being addressed by leading educators such as Ernest Boyer of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. As part of a study Boyer (1992) wrote:

> We believe the time has come to move beyond the tired old "teaching versus research" debate and give the familiar and honorable term "scholarship" a broader, more capacious meaning, one that brings legitimacy to the full scope of academic work. Surely, scholarship means engaging in original research. But the work of the scholar also means stepping back from one's investigation, looking for connections, building bridges between theory and practice, and communicating one's knowledge effectively to students. (p.16)

Another study, but this time with an international scope, titled the *Carnegie Foundation International Survey of Attitudes and Characteristics of Faculty Members* was carried out from 1991-1993. It surveyed some 20,000 faculty in 13 countries (including the U.S. and Hong Kong) with results published by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching as "The Academic Profession: An International Perspective." It appeared in the September 1994 Almanac issue of *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. U. S. data relating to this study has been retrieved and selected faculty responses on attitudes and characteristics of faculty are reproduced below.

My interest leans to or lies primarily in:
Teaching - 63%
Research - 37%

My affiliation with my institution is very important - 36% agree.

My affiliation with my academic discipline is very important - 77% agree.

In my department it is difficult for a person to achieve tenure if he or she does not publish - 75% agree.

The pressure to publish reduces the quality of teaching at this institution - 42% agree.

A strong record of successful research activity is important in faculty evaluations at this institution - 76% agree.

Publications used for promotion decisions are just counted, not qualitatively evaluated - 45% agree.

At this institution, we need better ways to evaluate teaching performance - 73% agree.

Student opinions should be used in evaluating the teaching effectiveness of faculty - 73% agree.

My teaching is regularly evaluated by:
My peers in my department - 49%
The head of the department - 78%
My students - 91%

In 1988, William E. Cashin of the Center for Faculty Evaluation and Development at Kansas State University noted that as of that date, over 1300 articles and books had been written on just the topic of student ratings of faculty. When added to the recent deluge of writing and publishing in all aspects of teaching and its related "academic companion" of research/scholarship, professional and popular literature available in the field is nearly overwhelming. Additionally, more and more institutions are beginning to allocate resources and "person power" to study the various aspects of teaching/research/scholarship with mixed results.

Ideally, there should be a positive connection between research and teaching. However, in practice, that occurs less frequently than it should. A 1994 Michigan State University study, *Report of the Committee on Improvement, Evaluation and Rewards for Teaching*, stated that "research should not be seen as something you 'show off' with other people who are outside, but to help you learn to be a good teacher." (p. 28) At the same time, the report admitted that "research is sort of the coin of the realm, whereas teaching is more of a local phenomenon." (p. 36) Furthermore, the faculty committee which carried out this study noted that in practice, "You can be an outstanding or good researcher and a poor teacher and be rewarded. You can't be a good teacher and a poor researcher and be rewarded." (p. 35)

An earlier study reported in 1992 by Syracuse University supported by the Lilly Endowment which included 33 public and 14 private universities came to a similar conclusion. Of 46,193 surveys distributed, 23,302 or approximately 50% were returned from faculty deans and administrators. The results showed that the people in the university community appeared to favor a balance between research and teaching, but the respondents to the survey reported that "the university places greater emphasis on research than on teaching." (p. 5) It was found that "faculty perceive deans as favoring research while, on average, deans view themselves as favoring teaching." (p. 8) In support of the institution's leanings towards research, the study disclosed that the reward system itself emphasizes research over teaching. An interesting finding in this study noted that "the closer one is to the central administration, or the further removed one is from direct instructional responsibilities, the more that an individual or office is perceived as being biased toward research." (p. 8)

Peter Seldin (1990) in his compilation of articles on teaching and the impact of research expectations on the instructional responsibilities of faculty spoke to this issue in the Preface to *How Administrators Can Improve Teaching* as follows:

> Almost all colleges and universities profess to be committed to effective teaching, as is evident in their brochures and catalogues. Even a cursory examination of these reassures us that the institutions are fervently dedicated to high quality instruction.

> However, this representation is open to challenge from those who teach and those who learn in today's colleges and universities. A disquieting number of faculty and students argue that their personal experience belies the officially stated reverence for teaching. The fact of the matter is that most colleges and universities, despite the rhetoric to the contrary, favor research and scholarly performance over teaching in making recruitment, promotion and tenure decisions.
>
> Teaching is widely undervalued today. The faculty member more interested in teaching than in scholarly research is soon forced by the institution's reward system to reverse direction. There is some truth to the common notion that professors are paid to teach but are rewarded for research and publication. (p. xvii)

Philosophically, there appears to be support in the academic community for the importance of maintaining a balance between teaching and research/scholarship. Certainly, classroom teaching demands subject matter currency and the teaching/learning process cannot continue to be enhanced without keeping up with one's discipline and advancements in the "knowledge industry." However, the literature cites increasing instances where the reward system fails to recognize this effort to the same degree that publication activity is accepted. J. A. Centra (1993) writes:

> The conflict between teaching and research has plagued a large segment of American higher education since the research function was first brought to American universities from Germany in late 1800's. The basic conflict, between what many faculty members find rewarding and what they believe their institutions reward, remains today. (p. 3)

As he continues to express concern over the status of teaching in higher education he notes:

> At most research universities, teaching receives a low priority, in spite of lip service paid to its importance. And at institutions where research is not emphasized, many faculty members do not have confidence in the methods used to evaluate teaching. (p. 19)

Stimulated by a grant from The Fund for the Improvement of Post Secondary Education of the United States Department of Education, as well as university funds, The University of Nebraska--Lincoln conducted a three year study (1989-1992) on "how to improve the climate for undergraduate teaching at an institution heavily oriented toward research." (p. 3 of the *Final Report)* The study focused on faculty attitudes. A survey, which was a major part of the project, "revealed that faculty questioned whether administrators valued the effort devoted by faculty to teaching."

Furthermore, it was determined "that the reward system was the influence on faculty opinion that was most susceptible to change through institutional action." (p. 4) The goals established for the study, although directed to The University of Nebraska--Lincoln could very well be generalized to most research and/or comprehensive institutions of higher education. Specifically, they sought:

- To insure that effective teaching is rewarded at The University of Nebraska--Lincoln.
- To strengthen the climate for teaching and learning.
- To provide a process model for enhancement of teaching recognition.
- To develop model plans for departmental approaches to the recognition and reward of teaching. (p. 4)

As part of this study, a campus survey looked into the faculties' *perceptions* of how teaching was regarded by institutional administrators. The results showed that "to the faculty, most administrators, at every level, appeared to have low regard for effort devoted to teaching. In general, faculty members thought that they themselves placed a higher value on teaching than did the institution." (p. 7) When administrators were shown the results, they were "shocked and distressed." (p. 7)

The researchers in the Nebraska study found that peer pressure plays a big part in how faculty respond to the teaching/research issue. Before appropriate credit for good teaching can be given, it must be accepted as creditable in the academy. Until it has "high status" among faculty members, significant actual changes in the recognition and reward system for excellence in the classroom will not materialize. (p. 2) However, the *Final Report* of the Nebraska study notes that, to date, some progress has occurred on the campus and that more is expected as the study is implemented. Additional departments, beyond the twenty-eight reported as of 1992, will be added to the study each year.

Towson State University (Maryland) has addressed the issue of teaching and the reward system in its *Faculty Roles and Rewards Guidebook*. It notes that teaching is central to the mission of the university and it develops strong support for the importance of effective teaching. It also speaks to four faculty role profiles, namely: Teacher/Scholar, Scholar/Teacher, Teacher/Service and Service/Teacher. (p. 3) The professional expectations of faculty center around teaching, scholarly growth, and service. However, it is clear that all activities are meant to contribute to the enhancement of the teaching/learning process. On the other hand, faculty may choose their particular area of concentration which may vary from year to year.

The Guidebook notes that Towson State University has endorsed the scholarship categories outlined by Boyer (1992): Scholarship of Teaching, Scholarship of

Discovery, Scholarship of Integration and Scholarship of Application. It appears that this university is being influenced by Boyer's challenge to the higher education community to revisit the traditional role of the professoriate and to consider placing teaching in a more central place in the hierarchy of faculty activity.

Terensini and Pascarella (1994), after reviewing some 2,600 books, articles and other related publications, identified at least five myths about undergraduate education. Myth number three was particularly pertinent to this study. It reads as follows: "The good teachers are good researchers." (p. 6) Their conclusion reads as follows:

> Teaching and research appear to be more or less independent activities. Each is essential to the mission of most of our colleges and universities, and each deserves recognition and reward. Until the good researcher--good teacher myth is put to rest however, the research on effective teaching methods will continue to be ignored, reward structures will continue to go unexamined, good researchers will be excused for marginally competent teaching and good teachers who do not publish will continue to be denied tenure. (p. 31)

Referring to a comprehensive literature review conducted by K.A. Feldman in 1987, Terensini and Pascarela reported that "Scholarly productivity and instructional effectiveness have less than 2 percent of their variance in common." (p. 30) The basis for this conclusion was a review of more than 40 studies on faculty productivity and instructional effectiveness. However, continuing to discuss this myth, the authors summarized their study as noted below:

> So long as the myth that research and teaching are closely and positively related persists, promotion and tenure decisions will continue to be made on the presumption that an institution can have the best of both worlds by allowing research productivity to dominate the faculty reward structure. Why bother to scrutinize *both* the teaching and research abilities of candidates for appointment, promotion and tenure if looking mostly at the one will do? Find and reward good researchers, the logic goes, and chances are high you'll find and reward a good teacher. (p. 30)

A National Survey of Post Secondary Faculty (NSOPF) in 1987-1988 surveyed 11,071 faculty members from 480 colleges and universities nationally with a 76% response rate representing 424 institutions. The study examined "the relationships between faculty pay and four activities: teaching and instruction, research and scholarship, administration and public service." (Fairweather, p. 40) The results showed that:

- Faculty members who generated the fewest contact hours received the highest salaries.

- For full-time faculty members in public and private institutions, the more publications, the higher the compensation.

- Faculty members who spent the most time on administration earned the highest basic salaries at public and private four year institutions.

- Time spent on service was not related to pay for faculty at public two and four year institutions. (p. 46)

Although the study revealed some minor differences in the responses from two year, four year, private and public institutions, the overall theme gleaned from the survey was that "research and scholarship--as well as seniority and gender--were key determinants of faculty pay." (p. 53)

On April 5, 1990, Donald Kennedy, at that time President of Stanford University, in an address to the faculty stated:

> It is time for us to reaffirm that education--that is teaching in all its forms--is the primary task (of universities). We need to talk about teaching more, respect and reward those who do it well and make it first among our labor of love, and the personal responsibility of each one of us. (Anderson, p. 46)

Martin Anderson (1992), made reference to Kennedy's comments on teaching to emphasize the increased attention being given to the importance of teaching by leading national universities. He criticized the present "condition" of higher education as having lost some of its original purpose for being--teaching. His interpretation of the current status of the professoriate was expressed in the following statement: "Teaching is low man on the totem pole of academic prestige. What counts today is research and publishing and certain kinds of administrative work." (p. 49)

In an article Carolyn J. Mooney (1990) called attention to what may be beginning acceptance and acknowledgment of giving more than minimal attention to teaching. She observes that

> some institutions are confronting the problem by increasing the teaching loads of professors who do little research, rewarding excellent teachers who are not active scholars with merit raises but not promotions, and, in a few cases, establishing formal career tracks that allow professors to emphasize teaching or research. (p. 1)

The College of Business Administration of Georgia State University has opened up new vistas for faculty. Five career "profiles" have been identified as options for faculty to choose. They all carry minimum expectations for teaching, research, and

service but permit faculty to adopt a profile to pursue as an academician. The choices are:

- Traditional profile with equal weight for research and teaching
- Teaching profile
- Research profile
- Service profile
- Administrative profile

(*The Chronicle of Higher Education*, June 27, 1990, p. 19)

The plan was initially aimed at senior faculty who are inactive scholars. However, it is an approach which could command some attention from other institutions and which could be applicable to junior faculty. Having said this, one needs to recognize that any implementation of such a program would receive widespread criticism and as Mooney (1990) has stated, "it would foster a two class faculty system." (p. 19)

There is no question but that ideally, teaching and research must go hand in hand. In two separate articles which appeared in *The Chronicle of Higher Education* (June and August 1992) the pros and cons of this statement were discussed. Bryan Barnett stated his position by titling his piece "Teaching and Research Are Inescapably Incompatible" Robert McCoughey responded with an article titled "Why Research and Teaching Can Coexist," (Note the placement of *teaching* and *research* in the two titles). Barnett is suggesting that universities are on the verge of dividing into "one part devoted to undergraduate education and another to full time research." (p. A40) Two of the signs he sees as evidence that a division is coming are cited below:

- An increasing amount of teaching is being done by non-tenure track instructors (graduate students or semi-permanent visiting lecturers)
- Proposals for "teaching tracks" for tenure (proposed at the University of Colorado) and/or the establishment of a separate undergraduate teaching college within a university (proposal at the University of Michigan) (p. A40)

He further supported his position with general statements that the need to spend more time with students is conflicting with the demands of research. The implication here is that "research demands on individual faculty members will never leave enough time or energy for them to meet the need for devoted teaching and curriculum development." He went on to say that "The inescapable incompatibility of the demands of research and teaching...suggests that the overall mission of the university

might ultimately be better served by the open and conspicuous separation of the two." (p. A40)

McCoughey acknowledges that the "incompatibilitists" viewpoint dates back to John Henry Newman in the 1850's. In a series of lectures published as *The Idea of a University* Newman argued "that research, like theology, had no place in the university, which was to be devoted to undergraduate and non-professional education." (p. A36) In 1918, Thorstein Veblen published *The Higher Learning in America* and asserted that, "at most, the work of teaching properly belongs in the university only because and insofar as it incites and facilitates the University's main work of inquiry." (p. A36)

McCoughey stated that support for the "incompatibilities" has been given boosts through a series of national surveys conducted in 1969, 1977, 1984 and 1989 by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching as well as analyses of these data by such educators as Everett Carl Ladd, Jr., Seymour Martin Lipset, and Ernest L. Boyer. Their conclusions were substantially similar.

> Few faculty members nationwide actively engage in scholarly research or ever publish anything; many who do publish are in some measure coerced into it by tenure requirements; and most faculty members prefer to concentrate their energies on teaching, not research, and believe that teaching effectiveness, not publication, should be the primary criterion for promotion. (p. A36)

Yet, J.A. Centra (1993) writes "publication--not necessarily good research--continues to drive promotions at many institutions." (p. xii) He also makes reference to K.A. Feldman's (1987) "meta-analysis of twenty-nine studies that related teaching effectiveness with research productivity [and] found an average correlation of .12. While the correlation is positive, it is fairly small, indicating that the two functions are not highly related." (p. 141) He goes on to say that "No one questions the need for teachers to keep current in their fields; the question is whether they must carry on research in order to do so." (p. 143) His study of 4600 faculty members at different career stages and in different academic fields did not provide strong support for the need.

One cannot deny the merits of seeking a positive connection between teaching and research. Centra presents arguments supporting the importance of both activities. The following statements endorse both teaching and research:

- Some individuals' higher general ability and energy levels make them good at research and teaching (as well as in other professional roles).

Research influences teaching when the instructor's excitement and involvement is communicated to students and they are able to see knowledge as constantly growing. For a chemist to be able to share the excitement of discovery with students, it is

necessary to work in a laboratory, mix compounds together, and follow the resulting reactions. For a historian to teach students how to interpret the past, it is essential to work with old documents and artifacts, to feel the materials of history.... (Winkler, 1992)

- Research helps maintain the teacher's interest in the subject matter.

- Stimulating discussions with students in the classroom can lead to productive research.

Statements calling attention to the negative relationship existing between teaching and research follow:

- The rewards given to research at many institutions cause faculty members to put less effort into teaching.
- The time faculty members spend on research takes away from time they might spend preparing class sessions, grading papers, and meeting with students. Even those who are good teachers and researchers would be even better teachers if they devoted all their time to teaching.
- The abilities and personality traits needed to be a good researcher are different from those needed to be a good teacher.

Derek Bok, formerly president of Harvard University, wrote:

> Although there are smaller colleges where teaching remains the overriding priority, in the modern university the incentives are not weighted in favor of teaching and education--indeed, quite the contrary is true. (Fairweather, 1994, p. 39)

The University of Wisconsin at Madison has been involved in the enhancement of the quality of its undergraduate education since 1989. A Faculty Senate University Committee on Teaching Quality, Evaluation, and Rewards was formed in 1991. It issued its report in 1992 and made a series of recommendations aimed at improving the quality, rewards and incentives for teaching at the institution.

Early on, the committee noted that "professional pressures, the reward system for faculty members and inadequate support have created a climate for teaching that is cause for serious concern." (p. 63) The report highlighted the four major components of academic work at universities and noted that other research universities were also addressing this issue. The four activities of scholarship were identified as follows:

1. The discovery of new knowledge (research).

2. The integration of new knowledge with existing knowledge, both within a discipline and among disciplines.

3. The transmission of knowledge to students through teaching in classrooms, in laboratories and in the field.

4. The application of knowledge to practical problems.

(Diamond and Adam 1993, p. 65)

These four categories of scholarship, which were highlighted by Boyer (1992), appear to be gaining prominence in the literature and often are substituted for the traditional tripartite missions of universities--teaching, research and service. As noted earlier, Towson State has also accepted this approach.

Among the Committee's eleven recommendations for improving the teaching/learning process on campus, the following excerpts are especially pertinent to this project:

> Colleges, schools, departments and programs, as appropriate to their respective missions, should allocate at least 20% of the annual merit pool to reward excellence in teaching.
>
> Departments and other units where faculty members hold appointments should create a mechanism through which a faculty member could propose a personal short-term (for example, three year) work plan that states the goals and a plan for a division of efforts among specific teaching, research and service projects that serve the mission of the department and the university.
>
> Departments and programs should evaluate faculty performance in teaching and learning every year for probationary faculty and at least once every three years for tenured faculty on the basis of (a) performance of assigned duties in relation to the unit mission and (b) effectiveness of learning as indicated by as many of the following as appropriate: student perceptions of their learning process, measurement of student preparation for subsequent classes, student performance in relation to departmental expectations, peer evaluation of classroom teaching, peer evaluation of the contents of a self prepared "teaching dossier" or similar document.
>
> Departments, schools, colleges and appropriate administrative offices should work together to improve instruments for evaluating the effectiveness of teaching and learning and initiate corrective action if those evaluations indicate problems. Each instructor should use a student questionnaire, as suggested by the appropriate divisional committee, in every course taught every semester. (p. 66)

In 1992, Virginia Commonwealth University appointed a Committee to look into "the relationship and balance between the institution's mission and its system of rewarding faculty." (Diamond and Adam, 1993 p. 67) The report stated that "An

institution's system of faculty roles and rewards must balance individual aspirations and abilities against the institutional mission." (p. 67) At the same time, the university examined the relative priorities that faculty should be giving to the traditional teaching, research and service areas and "how these priorities should vary across units (for example, department, school or college)." (p. 68)

In 1990, the Fund for the Improvement of Post Secondary Education (FIPSE) helped fund The Focus on Teaching Project for six research universities: the University of California at Berkeley, Carnegie-Mellon University, the University of Massachusetts at Amherst, Northwestern University, Ohio State University and the University of Michigan. Included in its objectives were the charges to

> identify existing reward systems and encourage development of new ones so that greater weight is placed on undergraduate teaching and advising and assist academic units in developing a definition of creativity and scholarship for use in tenure and promotion decisions that reflect the nature of the discipline and the creative and scholarly aspects of teaching-related activities. (p. 78)

After two and a half years of study, reports submitted by each institution revealed noticeable philosophical progress individualized to the culture of each institution. Of particular significance to the outcome was the contribution this project made to the need to examine the challenged teaching/research importance extant on each campus.

A recurring theme that seems to run through the literature on faculty performance evaluations and recognition and rewards for effective teaching is that administrators are the key to the implementation of the process, whatever it might be. As Seldin stated in his publication *How Administrators Can Improve Teaching*,

> One of the most important actions an academic administrator can take to improve teaching is to assess it accurately and to reward it when effective. To say that the institution values teaching, when in reality it rewards research and scholarship is not a credible message. (p. 203)

Seldin continues by noting that

> good teaching is a motherhood-and-apple-pie-issue--no one is against it. The problems affecting good teaching are inertia, overcoming fear of change, and the fact that faculty priorities may be elsewhere... Making good teaching an institutional priority requires changing values, behaviors, and academic norms. (p. 201)
>
> Excellence in teaching should be placed on an equal plane with excellence in scholarly productivity.... Teaching and learning are the heart of an educational institution. (pp. 207-208)

National and institutional studies and surveys appear to substantiate the fact that "faculty activities are rewarded differently and ... research suggests that research and scholarship are valued more highly than teaching in promotion and tenure, but the relationship between teaching and faculty pay is less clear." (NEA 1991 Almanac, p. 44) In a National Survey of Post Secondary Faculty (NSOPF), referred to earlier, three competing propositions on teaching and salaries were examined:

- Teaching was a positive factor in compensation--the highest salaries went to faculty members who spent more time teaching and whose teaching productivity was high.
- Teaching was a neutral factor in compensation.
- Teaching was a negative factor in compensation--the lowest salaries went to faculty members who spent more time teaching and whose productivity was high. (p. 40)

The results of the study showed that

> pay and percent of time spent on teaching and instruction were inversely related in all types of public four year colleges and universities. Faculty members who taught for less than 35% of their time in 1988 received an average of about $54,000; colleagues who taught for three quarters or more time received about $35,000....Overall, pay decreased with hours spent in class for faculty members. (p. 44)

By the same token, "the more time spent on research and scholarship, the higher the pay for faculty in public and private colleges and universities overall." (p. 46) Not surprisingly, "Faculty members who spent the most time on administration earned the highest basic salaries at public and private four year institutions." (p. 46)

This NSOPF study therefore, concluded that "faculty members who spent more time on research, and who published the most were paid more than their teaching oriented colleagues." Even though the study is nearly seven years old, current studies and surveys examined continue to report the same condition.

An article by Steven Kerr (1995), began with the following statement:

> Whether dealing with monkeys, rats, or human beings, it is hardly controversial to state that most organisms seek information concerning what activities are rewarded, and then seek to do (or at least pretend to do) those things, often to the virtual exclusion of activities not rewarded. (p. 7)

Throughout the article, he addresses the reward system as it applies to several areas such as politics, medicine, sports, government, business and universities. With reference to universities, Kerr writes:

> Society hopes that professors will not neglect their teaching responsibilities but rewards them almost entirely for research and publications...Cliche's such as "good research and good teaching go together," notwithstanding, professors often find that they must choose between teaching and research-oriented activities when allocating their time. Rewards for good teaching are usually limited to outstanding teacher awards, which are given to only a small percentage of good teachers and usually bestow little money and fleeting prestige. Punishments for poor teaching are also rare.
>
> Rewards for research and publications, on the other hand, and punishments for failure to accomplish these, are common. Furthermore, publication oriented resumes usually will be well-received at other universities, whereas teaching credentials, harder to document and quantify, are much less transferable. Consequently, it is rational for university professors to concentrate on research even to the detriment of teaching and at the expense of their students. (p. 9)

In 1987, Congress passed legislation establishing The Malcolm Baldridge National Quality Award (Baldridge Award). Initially intended to apply to "quality improvement to the national economy," a decision was reached in 1993 to extend these recognition awards to education (Baldridge, p. 1). Pilot activities were launched in 1994 and 1995 to "address the many issues that arise in extending eligibility to education." (Baldridge, p. 1) One of the Education Pilot Program's objectives was: "to determine the interest and readiness of education organizations to participate in a national level recognition program based upon the ability to demonstrate overall performance improvement." (p. 3)

Interest was expressed in focusing on learning and the needs of learners as well as classroom delivery systems at all levels of education. The program noted that "education delivery needs to be built around learning effectiveness. Teaching effectiveness needs to be defined in terms of learning effectiveness." (p. 3) It acknowledged that individual educational institutions have different missions, roles, and programs, but student learning is "common to all." In fact, "those who encourage the creation of a Baldridge Award Category for education cite improvement in teaching and learning as their primary or only rationale for such an award." (p. 8) Certainly, the importance of research in the educational process is not being overlooked, but the program planners are suggesting that the educational value of research be included as part of teaching and learning. In any event, "Peer review systems exist to evaluate research. Funding organizations and businesses provide avenues to channel the directions of much research. Numerous excellent forums and media already exist for sharing research results." (p. 8) Since teaching/learning has, by comparison, received less attention and recognition, it is

felt that a national thrust in support of this aspect of the educational process would be in order.

V. RESULTS OF THE INTERVIEWS

This above review of literature provided an excellent background for this case study and it helped set the stage for the interviews conducted. An analysis of the one on one faculty sessions in this study was designed to elicit responses to five general open ended questions related to teaching, performance evaluations and faculty recognition and rewards. Personal interviews between the author and a total of forty selected faculty were held on each campus of the six Regents universities. These faculty represented the following grouped disciplines:

Sciences, Math and Engineering	-	14
Education, Social Sciences and Humanities	-	12
Law, Business and Management	-	9
Fine Arts	-	5

Together, they represented 586 years of teaching experience, averaging 14.65 years. They were in their current professorial rank for an overall average of 6 years. The full professors averaged 8.5 years, the associate professors 5.2 years and the assistant professors 5.4 years. The responses were recorded with the understanding that no faculty member or institution would be identified. The result was forty unrehearsed, unstructured "discussions" focused around the five questions identified below. The interviewees were most cooperative, candid, willing and in many cases enthusiastic about being asked to express their feelings about the issues of teaching, performance evaluations and faculty recognition and rewards.

Question #1: WHAT IS GOOD TEACHING?

One of the most comprehensive definitions of teaching can be attributed to William E. Cashin (1989) of Kansas State University. He suggests that there are seven different areas involved in collegiate teaching in his *IDEA paper No.21*. They include:

- Subject matter mastery
- Curriculum development
- Course design
- Delivery of instruction

- Assessment of instruction
- Availability to students
- Administrative requirements (completed and on time)

It is interesting to note that each of these aspects of teaching was identified in some way by the majority of the forty interviewees. In their responses to the question of how they would define good teaching they expanded upon the above ingredients indicating a good understanding of the broad range of tasks connected with teaching. Additionally, teaching was described as contributing to the enhancement of the learning process, thereby tying the two--teaching and learning--into a joint function. Specifically, appropriate quotes from the faculty, related to teaching, follow:

- "Effective teaching is facilitating learning."
- "...taking people where they are and moving them ahead in learning."
- "...conveying your enthusiastic love of your discipline."
- "...constructing projects that teaches them [students] the relevance of the information...excites them to want to learn more."
- "...involving the student intimately and personally in the learning process."
- "...motivating the students' thirst for learning."
- "...nurturing and achieving a communication level that continues to motivate, set standards and identify priorities."
- "I think that the greatest contribution that I can give is to be in the classroom and be a model to other people."
- "We expect good teaching. Our department would fall apart if we didn't have good teaching."
- "Universities exist to teach, so everything else we do ought to relate to teaching."
- "Research demands will never leave enough time or energy to meet the needs of teaching."
- "I think that the major universities need to put more emphasis on teaching also."

28

- "There's no one else in the office but the two of us (student and faculty member) and that's where the very best teaching takes place."

The faculty repeatedly expressed the feeling that one cannot be successful in the classroom without developing a sensitivity to the students' varying backgrounds and experience, and without establishing a teaching/learning rapport with a class. Also, they noted that a sincere display of enthusiasm and interest in the students and the subject matter is an essential component of the process. Noticeable signs of concern and respect for the students throughout a course also contributes to success in teaching and learning. Additionally, several references were made to the importance of mentoring and advising when appropriate and desirable. And, in various ways, the faculty interviewees highlighted the ultimate mark of effective teaching as developing the skill to instill in students a life long interest in learning. This can be accomplished by actively involving students in the learning process as a routine part of the teaching techniques utilized.

The respondents appeared to have a good understanding of the ingredients that go into making teaching effective although there were several concerns expressed about the current procedures being used to evaluate good teaching. There was general agreement that all of the usual components included in the teaching process were essential, but the assessment techniques currently being applied leave much to be desired. The importance of student, peer, administrative, and outside evaluations was acknowledged, but the weighting of each still causes concerns. At the same time, there continues to be negative feelings about the quantifiable aspects of the teaching instruments. In the opinion of several faculty, a proper performance evaluation of teaching should avoid attaching too much significance to "numbers." The rationale for this position is that a process such as teaching should be measured effective or ineffective primarily by measuring learning, and so the evaluation instrument needs to assess the output of the teaching/learning process. However, the results cannot always be measured immediately and often they are not realized until sometime into the future.

There have been hundreds of attempts to describe a good teacher and each one has merit and can be defended. For purposes of this case study, the following definition is offered and recommended as a representative model for consideration. It was prepared by the Academy for Effective Teaching at Wichita State University and presented in 1995 to the Faculty Senate "not as a definition but as a characterization of the good teacher." It includes the primary characteristics essential for the effective teacher.

> The good teacher knows the students as well as the discipline, and, with strategies and materials appropriate to their abilities, nonacademic concerns, and academic and personal goals, enthusiastically presents the subjects of the discipline in such a way as to create a climate conducive to learning, stimulate interest and appreciation, and challenge intellectual growth.

In doing so, the good teacher communicates knowledge, concepts, skills, and attitudes of and beyond the discipline in such a way that students increasingly come to recognize the role of scholarship in the teaching/learning process, willingly accept increased responsibility for their part in the process, and expend their best efforts to fulfill that responsibility.

The good teacher is one whose students learn and change. (Academy for Effective Teaching, Wichita State University, April 3, 1995.)

QUESTION #2: **ARE TEACHING AND RESEARCH COMPLEMENTARY FACULTY FUNCTIONS OR DO THEY COMPETE WITH EACH OTHER? EXPLAIN.**

There was near unanimity among the respondents that ideally, teaching and research *should be* complementary faculty functions. However, the majority stated that *realistically*, even under the best of circumstances, the two activities compete for faculty time. Noting that the time available for meeting the requirements of the professoriate was the same for all faculty, individual priority allocations of time, effort and emphasis sometimes distorted the balance. Depending on the mission of the institution, the attention to each of these functions varied. However, there was a strong sentiment among the interviewees that whatever research or scholarly activity was performed, it should be directly related to the students and the subject matter.

In several instances a clear distinction was made between undergraduate and graduate teaching. The importance of good teaching at both levels seems to be a given. But, there were differences of opinion expressed about research being of equal value at both levels. One third of the respondents did not feel that complex subject matter research can be translated adequately to undergraduate students. Therefore, in their judgement, for the teachers of undergraduates, faculty research would not have a significant impact on them or their classes. In any event, overall, the faculty interviewed endorsed both positions--teaching and research--and stated that they can be complementary, but competitive *for time*. Excerpt faculty quotes are noted:

- "A decision has got to be made about what is going to be a realistic balance."
- "Because we are asked to publish ... I think that that infringes on the teaching area a great deal."
- "Research is important, but it begins to take a priority that takes away from the other areas" (teaching and service).

- "Doing them (teaching and research) concurrently, I think, is a little taxing."
- "It's sometimes difficult with high contact hours (teaching) to be involved in intense research ... It's a juggling act."
- "If I could devote all of my effort to my classes and let the research flow from the needs of the class, to try to make the class better, I would love it."
- "I'm seeing increasingly the two (teaching and research) competing with one another and I can tell you generally what's going to come out second and that's the instructional responsibilities."
- "In reality, what we have set up is essentially a two class system" (teaching and research).
- "There's a lot of anxiety surrounding the whole research area."
- "The clash between research and teaching is only a clash of time to me."
- "The research that I really enjoy is the research dealing with practical issues that I have talked about in class... You can see a more immediate effect."
- "In the current academic environment, there's a great deal of contempt for people who can't publish. The idea is that they are lightweights or that they are lazy."
- "I don't get a sense of personal satisfaction out of the things that I've published... Ideally, I would like a portion to relate to the classroom."

Junior faculty members at the early stages of their careers reported that they accepted teaching and research as ideally complementary, but the implied pressure to do research to progress has helped to create a tilt away from teaching and students. Many of the untenured faculty reported that senior faculty consistently advise them to spend less time on their teaching activities until their publication records are established. To quote an untenured assistant professor, "If you are moving towards tenure, you get involved in as little instruction as you can possibly get by with." At the other end of the professoriate, full professors indicated that as seniority began to take hold, they continued to see the two functions as professionally complementary. However, their interests in research waned primarily because they felt that they "had arrived."

QUESTIONS #3 **IF YOU COULD CHOOSE YOUR *PRIMARY* AREA OF PROFESSIONAL CONCENTRATION--TEACHING OR RESEARCH--WHICH WOULD IT BE AND WHY?**

In responding to this question, the faculty saw an opportunity to speak to an issue of deep concern to them. Extreme positions were articulated, but overall, they appeared to lean toward teaching as a preferred activity. In fact, 80% indicated unequivocally that if they were given an option, they would choose to concentrate primarily on teaching, yet recognized the need to keep current through continuing "teaching related" scholarly activities. They preferred to be designated as teacher/scholars rather than scholar/ teachers. However, 10% expressed equally strong feelings about their preference and commitment to research especially at the publication level and they described their roles as being scholar/teachers. The remaining 10% were equally emphatic in stating that the two functions were so clearly entwined and dependent on each other that no preference could be given to one or the other. Pertinent quotes from the interviews are reproduced below:

- "I feel that my main responsibility is to be an excellent teacher in the classroom and remain professionally active."
- "I think that those people that had the greatest impact on me were the teacher/scholars and I would aspire to that myself."
- "If I had my choice, I would do almost all teaching."
- "I've always enjoyed teaching and I consider that my primary role."
- "I have purposely chosen a place where teaching is supposed to be of equal value."
- "Teaching is still the primary reason that we are here. I think that needs to be upheld."
- "Teaching is why I became a teacher."
- "By being a scholar, I think that it makes you a better teacher."
- "Creativity/research performance is a way of demonstrating to the university and to students that you are a life long learner."
- "I think that we overestimate the transference of knowledge from traditional research to teaching."
- "I think there are lots of ways to keep up on your scholarships that improves your teaching that may or may not look like traditionally defined research."
- "In my own field, the research that I do rarely corresponds to the teaching that I am required to do."

- "I've never taken the definition of research to be only publishing papers. I've taken it to be keeping an active mind."

- " I enjoy the scholarship aspect more than teaching."

- "The research I do outside of particular courses keeps me updated, keeps me knowing what's going on out there."

Question #4 **COMMENT ON THE CURRENT FACULTY PERFORMANCE EVALUATION INSTRUMENT USED IN YOUR ACADEMIC UNIT IN THE AWARDING OF TENURE AND/OR PROMOTIONS AS WELL AS SALARY ADJUSTMENTS. DESCRIBE THE "WEIGHTING" GIVEN TO THE DIFFERENT COMPONENTS, AS WELL AS THE *ACTUAL* AND *PERCEIVED* USE OF THE INSTRUMENT. HOW WOULD YOU CHANGE THE POLICIES AND PROCEDURES TO BRING ABOUT AN *IDEAL* SYSTEM?**

This question brought out the differences among the institutions as well as the various evaluation instruments being used by each university. It also was apparent that faculty performance evaluation instruments were commanding considerable attention among the faculties, in part, because of a Board of Regents directive requesting universities to review their current procedures. Each of the institutions was in varying stages in the process, but a common theme emerged and that was that the advisability of a single instrument for all universities, faculty, and disciplines was questionable. Because of the different missions of the universities and the discipline idiosyncracies, various component percentage "weighting" came to the surface covering the areas of *teaching*, *research* and *service* as follows:

70/20/20	60/20/20	45/45/10	40/30/30
60/30/10	50/30/20	40/40/20	

These were the "numbers" the individual faculty perceived to be the guidelines. In some colleges of the six universities, it was reported that slight adjustments can be negotiated by the faculty members at the beginning of each academic year. However, the feeling was prevalent among a majority of the faculty that, regardless of the guidelines, in most cases subjective *overall* evaluations ended up favoring research. There appeared to be an acceptance of the concept of performance evaluations although many questions were still raised about the merit of the particular instruments used. Also, of even greater significance, there was considerable skepticism expressed about ever coming up with an evaluative technique that could truly capture and measure effective quality teaching. Little concern was offered about the measurable evaluation of research activity, both quantitatively and qualitatively. Additionally, the fact that tenure, promotions, and salary adjustments were dependent almost completely on a process that many interpreted to be imbalanced, created some concern. The interviewees stressed

repeatedly that the great diversity that exists among the institutions, their missions, the disciplines, and the varied interests and areas of expertise of the faculty demands recognition and acceptance for these variations. The commonalities extant among the institutions do not compensate for the many differences that exist. Faculty statements made regarding performance evaluations, the evaluation process, and the instruments being used system wide are listed:

- "I think it is very difficult to come up with a merit document or some kind of evaluative tool that's going to make everybody happy."
- "We are primarily a teaching institution, yet everything we hear now is you have to do research. You have to publish...."
- "One has to adopt the definition of research according to the field."
- "I think that the majority of our faculty are convinced that the major emphasis is on research, if you want promotions and salary increases....."
- "Even if you did perfect teaching, you're not going to get tenured" (with reference to the need to excel in research).
- "It disturbs me that evaluations are moving in the direction of quantifying everything...I think you have to trust the people that you have hired to make those evaluations and to do them fairly."
- "You had better do the things that are going to get recognition and that's primarily research."
- "You only have so much time and you like to use it for what the system is going to reward" (reference to research).
- "I see young faculty, particularly those working toward tenure and promotions really having a struggle balancing teaching and research."
- "There is an expectation that we are all good teachers...But, that doesn't amount to a hill of beans in terms of your promotion, tenure, and salary adjustments."
- "I think that academic respectability comes from publications."
- "We're in deep trouble because we devote most of our time to teaching."
- "There's concern among the assistant professors bordering on paranoia that we're going to get gunned down in the tenure and promotion process because our emphasis is so strongly on teaching."

- "I was regularly told (by peers) don't spend time on your teaching, you have to focus on your research... and I shouldn't spend so much time with students."

- "I think it's important to give recognition to teaching accomplishments as you do research accomplishments. And that isn't done."

- "I spend my time improving my teaching, whether that be related to research or service."

Even though a number of the faculty raised questions about evaluations being used system wide, none could offer significant improvements in the process. It appears that fine tuning of present practices, with room for flexibility, would satisfy many of the concerns expressed. However, as the above comments indicate, regardless of the instrument used, faculty perceptions of how the system actually works is going to color whatever process is accepted.

Question #5 **WOULD YOU BE SUPPORTIVE OF AN EVALUATION SYSTEM WHICH WOULD RECOGNIZE AND REWARD FACULTY IN ACCORDANCE WITH THEIR PROFESSIONAL STRENGTHS AND INTERESTS, THEIR DISCIPLINES *AND* THE INSTITUTION'S MISSION? OR SHOULD FACULTY EVALUATION PRACTICES AT *ALL* INSTITUTIONS BE BASICALLY SIMILAR TO INSURE QUALITY STANDARDIZATION? WOULD "CUSTOMIZING" FACULTY EVALUATIONS TO THE INSTITUTION AND INDIVIDUAL FACULTY MEMBERS CREATE A "HIERARCHY" IN THE PROFESSORIATE? DISCUSS.**

The faculty were generally supportive of the concept of a flexible and customized performance evaluation system. The broad range of disciplines represented by the interviewees quickly brought this position to the forefront. The differences in terms of discipline, institutional missions and personal preferences appeared paramount in the discussions offered on this subject. There was general agreement among the respondents on the need to recognize higher education as a multi-faceted institution. Therefore, standardized and common approaches to particular operational aspects of this complex enterprise were rejected by the group. It was implied that in many respects the higher education institutions were more dissimilar than similar and that the faculty components in each one further individualized the campus environments. The interviewees noted that any attempt to force all universities to fall into place in a robotic fashion would meet with little support. The issue of the possible creation of a two class professoriate--teaching oriented and research oriented--was addressed. But, it was suggested that general acceptance of this concept by the higher education academy could help to extend academic respectability to all professional activities associated with the professoriate. Specific quotes referring to this issue follow:

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

- "I think that there should be some flexibility ... If we believe in individual strengths and weaknesses, then we should encourage people to work their strengths."

- "I just think you have to do discipline by discipline. If we try to make it too uniform, it's just not going to work" (performance evaluation).

- "I know so many faculty members who are scholarly who have absolutely no or little teaching skills whatsoever."

- "Schools (higher education) have significantly different missions/roles and I would like to think that we could acknowledge those differences and still treat everyone as important faculty contributing to the community."

- "I think that there is some sense in noting the differences among the disciplines ... They are trying to put us all in the same book, and I really object."

- "To say that scholarship in our area is the same as what scholarship is in other areas, is not true and not appropriate."

- "You have to be flexible enough to allow people in different disciplines to express their scholarship in the way that makes sense to them and their disciplines."

- "I don't think there can be a standard way of evaluating faculty across institutions. We all have different missions and different strengths."

- "I think that you have to recognize them (faculty) as individuals because each of us brings unique qualities."

- "It would be important to allow an educator to play to his/her strength and to reward that if the outcome was that students were getting a very good learning experience."

- "It (the university) doesn't capitalize on people's strengths."

- "I think it is ludicrous to hold people accountable to the same agenda from point of entry as an untenured assistant professor to the point of exit as a 65 year old faculty member."

- "I think that one of the mistakes that institutions make is not playing to a faculty member's strengths by forcing each person to participate in settings where they really aren't effective (teaching or research). We all have strengths. I don't think they get utilized particularly well."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

- "I would hope that they (evaluations) could be different. But I would also hope that it could be different by discipline or by what you do."

- "Forcing you into three areas each year (teaching, research and service) does not reward a person for using his strength."

The above comments, as well as the discussions held with each of the forty faculty from the six Regents universities, would suggest that attention needs to be given to finding ways of satisfying some of the evaluation concerns raised.

VI. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A review of the literature in the areas of faculty performance evaluations and the recognition and rewards that follow revealed that higher education is revisiting these issues with mixed results. However, a basic theme has emerged which appears to be bringing about increased attention to the role of teaching in the higher education community. Certainly, the differences among colleges and universities are evident and recognized. Yet, there appears to be a tendency to want to get on a single track to the fulfillment of individual institutional missions. The literature calls attention to this development through a multitude of institutional and personnel studies conducted over the last decade. A representative selection of these studies and surveys centered around the topics of teaching and research and the role each plays in faculty recognition and rewards are included in Section IV. The publications cited philosophically support the importance of maintaining a proper balance between the two activities, but realistically note that, in practice, research continues to be more highly regarded in the academic world. The studies note that generally the faculty identify teaching as being a primary mission of higher education, but they feel that institutions do not support this position through the reward system. In fact, the records show that in actuality at the higher administrative echelons, "institutions" favor research over teaching, primarily because of the academic prestige associated with research. In nearly all of the studies reported, the faculty place a higher value on teaching than the administrations. Yet, the importance of teaching is nearly always emphasized by "the administration" as paramount.

In studies and surveys reported in the literature, statistically those faculty with the fewest student contact hours received the highest salaries and the more publications recorded, the higher the faculty salaries. Because of this, plus other non-monetary rewards such as tenure, promotions, lighter teaching loads, administrative support, and status, many faculty appeared to have turned to research for long-term survival. However, if the system rewarded excellence in both teaching and research on an equal plane, teaching with related scholarship activities would be favored over research unrelated to the teaching effort. As the literature emphasized, faculty are, for the most part, paid to teach but rewarded for research and publications.

It was interesting to note that increasingly, publications, surveys, studies, and conferences are suggesting that higher education begin to consider interpreting research much more broadly. Ernest Boyer's influence is evident as several institutions start to use the term scholarship as the umbrella for faculty activities with the functions of discovery, integration, applicability, and teaching as parts thereof. Towson State University in Maryland is an example of an institution taking on this look. More and more the higher education professoriate appears to be talking about scholarship and its many contributions to the teaching/learning process instead of research.

Some sixteen institutional, state, national, and international studies and surveys were referenced in one way or another in the literature review reported in Section IV. Over 60,000 returned surveys in studies conducted since 1990 provided the basis for the positions articulated on the condition of "the Academy" in this last decade of the 20th century. All this, in addition to the 40 plus years of higher education experience of the author, provided a working backdrop for the case study conducted and reported on in this paper. The end result of the 40 faculty campus interviews carried out among the six Kansas Regents universities showed that the Kansas Regents System of public higher education is in the mainstream nationally. Kansas institutions are being challenged with the same issues facing all of United States higher education institutions. And, they are reacting in a highly positive manner both institutionally and at the Regents level. With reference to the issues being raised by this case study, the diverse system of institutions is generally responding in line with the varying institutional missions unique to each one. By direction of the Regents, the individual institutions are developing appropriate faculty performance evaluation instruments with particular attention being given to the role of teaching. Both the Regents and the faculty interviewed have highlighted the learning aspect of the teaching/learning process and both are looking at teaching as the means to achieve the end product of learning.

A major issue raised in this study is the recognition that differences exist among higher education's universities and their faculties. These differences center around the missions of the institutions, the nature of the disciplines, the different individual career stages of the faculty, the levels of subject matter competencies among the faculty, and their preferred professional areas of concentration. However, a recognition of these differences is only a first step. This must be followed by action aimed at developing more flexible faculty performance evaluations and an equitable reward system. Also, institutions must learn to capitalize on the varied strengths, skills, and interests of their faculties. Such an approach is favored over applying punitive measures for failure to excel in the totality of professional activities generally expected of faculties.

Universities should pursue their individual educational missions and plan and program accordingly and creatively. They need to choose their own distinctive paths and direct their energies towards missions of their own and with minimal regard for

what every other institution is doing. Emulation will make us popular with our peers, but it does little to enhance the individuality of an institution.

In summary, a number of general impressions were gleaned from the faculty interviews/discussions and supported by a content analysis of the tapes. They constitute a composite of the 40 interviews and are offered as guidelines for analyzing the results of this Kansas Regents universities faculty case study.

- The importance of teaching at all types of institutions was reaffirmed by the faculty from all three professorial ranks.

- The majority of the interviewees became professors primarily to teach, but the research and service demands have frequently steered their energies away from teaching.

- The faculty appears to have an excellent sense of what good teaching is, especially as they tie it into *learning*, the ultimate measurable outcome.

- Ideally, teaching and research should be complementary faculty activities, but realistically, they compete for time and status.

- The faculty spoke to the differences among institutional missions, subject matter disciplines, competencies and interests of the professoriate. They also expressed support for flexibility and multiple models for evaluating faculty performance. In this connection, they did not appear to be overly concerned about creating a two tier faculty set-up through the different evaluation models that could emerge. They observed that a "caste system" already exists among disciplines. However, they advised caution to avoid abuses which could develop with too broad a selection of class models.

- All saw merit in considering a broadening of the definition of research and scholarship and particularly as such activity could relate to the teaching/learning process.

- There was nearly unanimous support for maintaining a high level of continuous scholarly activity directed towards the improvement of instruction.

- The feeling was expressed that the expectation for increased research is growing while the expectation for teaching remains the same.

- There appears to be a tendency for faculty to gravitate towards professional activities where the rewards are the greatest and it is their perception that the rewards are geared to research and publications.

- Regardless of the stated "component weighting" policies extant at the various institutions, the faculty perceives the system to favor research in the final evaluative analysis.

- In discussing actual and perceived policies and practices regarding the awarding of tenure, promotions, and salary adjustments with the faculty interviewees, it became apparent that the faculty and the academic administrators were not always on the same wave length.

In view of the above and based upon the collective data and experience accumulated and available to the author, the following recommendations are advanced to the Kansas Regents universities:

1. Require all faculty to maintain a high level of scholarship activity aimed at insuring currency and continuous upgrading of the teaching/learning process.

2. Redefine and broaden the meaning of research to include all types of scholarly activities unique to individual disciplines and recognize and reward such efforts equally. In addition to the traditional research leading to publications, acceptable scholarly activity might include presenting papers at professional meetings, writing academic reports, reviews, novels, poems, plays and musical scores. Also, artistic performances, developing video tapes, designing new courses and computer software, curricular and teaching innovations and exhibitions could be considered scholarly tasks.

3. Accept as "academically respectable" faculty whose preference is primarily teaching and attach equivalent status, prestige, recognition and rewards for successful annual performance evaluations as "teacher/scholars *or* scholar/teachers."

4. Base the recognition and reward system on individual faculty achievements of mutually agreed upon "annual goals contracts."

5. Adopt flexible models of faculty performance evaluations "customized" to the missions and needs of the universities, the different disciplines, and the competencies and preferences of the individual faculty members.

6. Eliminate the faculty's "perceived" gap between stated policies and actual practices regarding performance evaluations at each administrative level of review.

7. Adopt more flexible approaches to institutional expectations and annual evaluations of faculty at different stages of their professional careers. Also, recognize and accept developmental and performance changes that occur with experience and maturation.

VII. BIBLIOGRAPHY

A Faculty Guide for Relating Public Service to the Promotion and Tenure Review Process (1993). The Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois, Champaign, Illinois.

Abrami, Philip C. & d'Apollonia, Sylvia (1990, Fall). The Dimensionality of Ratings and Their Use in Personal Decisions. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc. No.43.

Allen, Henry Lee (1995). Workload and Productivity: Case Studies. *The NEA 1995 Almanac of Higher Education*, NEA Publishing.

Anderson, Martin (1992). *Imposters in the Temple*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Angelo, Thomas A., & Cross, K. Patricia (1993). *Classroom Assessment Techniques, A Handbook for College Teaching*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

Arreola, Raoul A. (1995). *Developing a Comprehensive Faculty Evaluation System*, Bolton MA: Anker Publishing Company Inc.

Arreola, Raoul A. & Aleamoni, Lawrence M. (1990). Practical Decision in Developing and Operating a Faculty Evaluation System. *Student Ratings of Instruction: Issues for Improving Practice*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., No. 43.

Backhus, DeWayne Allan (1993). *Faculty Workload As a Function of Career Stage and Discipline at Four Year Public Comprehensive Colleges and Universities*, Ann Arbor, Michigan: UMI Dissertation Services.

Baldwin, R.G. (1979). The Faculty Career Process--Continuity and Change: A Study of College Professors at Five Stages of the Academic Career. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 40*, 689A, (University Microfilm No. 79-16, 663)

Baldwin, R. G. & Blackburn, R.T. (1981). Academic Career as a Development Process: Implications for Higher Education. *Journal of Higher Education*, 52 (6), 598-614.

Barnett, Bryan (1992, June 3). Teaching and Research Are Inescapably Incompatible. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, p. A-40.

Barrett, Leverne A. & Narveson, Robert D. (Project Directors) (1992). *From Regard to Reward, Final Report*. Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska-Lincoln.

Birnbaum, Robert (1988). *How Colleges Work: The Cybernetics of Academic Organization and Leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

Borg, Walter R., and Gall, Meredith Damien (1993). *Educational Research*. White Plains, New York: Longman, Inc.

Boyer, Ernest L. (1987). *College: The Undergraduate Experience in America*. New York, NY: Harper and Row.

Boyer, Ernest L. (1992). *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*. Princeton, New Jersey: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Braskamp, L.A. and Ory, J.C. (1994). *Assessing Faculty Work: Enhancing Individual and Institutional Performance*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass , Inc.

Cage, Mary Crystal (1995, January 20). Regulating Faculty Workloads. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, Vol. XLI No. 19, pp. A-30 - A-33.

Carnegie Council Series (1980). *Three Thousand Futures: The Next Twenty Years for Higher Education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

Cashin, William E. (1990, September). Student Ratings of Teaching: A Summary of the Research. *IDEA PAPER No. 20*, Kansas State University, Manhattan, KS: Center for Faculty Evaluation and Development.

Cashin, William E. (1989, September). Defining and Evaluating College Teaching. *IDEA Paper No. 21*, Kansas State University, Manhattan, KS: Center for Faculty Evaluation and Development.

Cashin, William E. (1990, September). Student Ratings of Teaching: Recommendations for Use. *IDEA Paper No. 22*, Kansas State University, Manhattan, KS: Center for Faculty Evaluation and Development.

Cashin, William E. (1992), March). Student Ratings: The Need for Comparative Data. *Instructional Evaluation and Faculty Development*, Vol. 12, No. 2.

Cashin, William E. & Downey, Ronald G. (1992). Using Global Student Rating Items for Summative Evaluation. *Journal of Education Psychology*, Vol. 84, No.4.

Cashin, William. E., Downey, Ronald G. & Sixbury, Glenn R. (1994). Global and Specific Ratings of Teaching Effectiveness and Their Relation to Course Objectives: Reply to Marsh. *The Journal of Educational Psychology*, Vol. 86, No.4.

Centra, J.A. (1993). *Enhancing Teaching and Determining Faculty Effectiveness*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

Chronicle of Higher Education, (1994, September 1). Vol. XLI. No. 1 Almanac Issue, Marion, Ohio.

Cohen, Peter A. (1990). Bringing Research into Practice. *Student Ratings Of Instruction: Issues for Improving Practice*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., No. 43.

Cross, Patricia & Angelo T. (1988). *Classroom Assessment Techniques, A Handbook for College Teaching*. National Center for Research to Improve Postsecondary Teaching and Learning, Board of Regents of the University of Michigan.

Diamond, Robert M. (1994). *Serving on Promotion and Tenure Committees, A Faculty Guide*. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Company Inc.

Diamond, Robert M. & Adam, Bronwyn E. (Editor 1993). *Recognizing Faculty Work: Reward System for the year 2000, New Directions for Higher Education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

Edgerton,Russell (1994, September/October). A National Market for Excellence in Teaching. *Change*, 10-25.

Edgerton, Russell (1993, July/August). The Re-examination of Faculty Priorities. *Change*.

Edgerton, Russell, Hutchings, Patricia & Quinlan, Kathleen (1991). The Teaching Portfolio, Capturing the Scholarship in Teaching. *The AAHE Teaching Initiative*, Washington D.C.: American Association for Higher Education.

Faculty Roles and Rewards Guidebook (1994). Towson, Maryland: Towson State University.

Fairweather, James S. (1994). The Value of Teaching, Research, and Service. *The NEA 1994 Almanac of Higher Education*, NEA Publishing, 35-58.

Finkelstein, Martin J. (1995). College Faculty as Teachers. *The NEA 1995 Alamanac of Higher Education*, NEA Publishing.

Fiscal Year 1996 Budget Analysis (submitted to the 1995 Legislature) *Kansas Legislative Research Department*

Fox, M.F. (1992). Research Teaching and Publication Productivity: Mutuality vs Competition in Academia. *Sociology of Education*, 65, 293-305.

Get Real. (1995, February 26). *60 Minutes* Transcript by Burrelle's Information Services, Livingston, NJ, Vol. XXVII, No. 25.

Gray, P.J., Froh, R.C., & Diamond, R.M. (1992). A National Study of Research Universities on the Balance Between Research and Undergraduate Teaching Center for Instructional Development, Syracuse NY: Syracuse University.

Greenberg, Milton (1993, October 20). Accounting for Faculty Member's Time. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, A68.

Guskin, Alan E. (1994, September/October). Restructuring The Role of Faculty. *Change* 16-25.

Hammond, Martine F. (1992). Crisis and Change, The Saving of a Small College. *The College Board Review*, College Entrance Examination Board, New York, N.Y., 10-13 and 25-27.

Jordan, Stephen M. (1994, Fall). What We Have Learned About Faculty Workload: The Best Evidence. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, No. 83, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 15-23.

Kerr, Steven (1995). On the Folly of Rewarding A, While Hoping for B. *Academy of Management Executive*, Vol. 9, No. 1, 7-16.

Leatherman, Courtney (1990, December 5). Definition of Faculty Scholarship Must Be Expanded to Include Teaching, Carnegie Foundation Says. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, Vol. XXXVII, No.14, A31-32.

Lederman, Douglas & Mooney, Carolyn J. (1995, April 14). Lifting the Cloak of Secrecy from Tenure. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, Volume XLT, No. 31, A16-A22.

Magner, Denise K. (1995, March 31). Tenure Re-Examined. *The Chronicle of Higher Education* Vol. XLI, No. 29, A17-A18.

Marsh, H.W. (1987 II). Student Evaluations of University Teaching: Research Findings, Methodological Issues, and Directions for Future Research. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 253-388.

McBeath, Ron J. (Editor) (1992). *Instructing and Evaluating in Higher Education*. New Jersey: Educational Technology Publications.

McCaughey, Robert A. (1992, August 5). Why Research and Teaching Can Co-exist. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, Vol. 38, p. A36.

Menges, Robert J. (1994, Fall). Preparing New Faculty for the Future. *The NEA Higher Education Journal*, Vol. X, No. 2, 81-93.

Menges, Robert J. (1991, Winter). The Real World of Teaching Improvement: A Faculty Perspective. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., No. 48.

Mission Development in the Kansas Regents System, 1993-2000, (1993, June). Kansas Board of Regents.

Mooney, C. (1994, June 22). The Shared Concerns of Scholars. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, Vol. XL, No. 42, A34-35.

Mooney, Carolyn J. (1990, June 27). Faculty Generation Gap Brings Campus Tensions, Debates over Rating of Professors. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, Vol. XXXVI, No. 41, pp. 1 and 18-19.

Policy Perspectives, (1991). The Pew Higher Education Research Program sponsored by The Pew Charitable Trusts, Vol. 4, No. 1 Philadelphia, PA.

Policy and Procedures Manual, (1987). Kansas Board of Regents section F, (revised).

Project to Improve and Reward Teaching (PIRT) (1994). A Faculty Initiated Project at the University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Pulvino, Charles J. & Pundt, John C. (1993). Distinguished Teachers and What We Can Learn From Them. *Teacher Education, 29*, 9-16.

Report of the Regents' Advisory Committee on Faculty Workload, The Evaluation and Reward of Teaching, (1994, June). Ohio Board of Regents, Columbus, Ohio.

Roush, Donald C. (1989). Strategies for Effective University Teaching. Center for Educational Development, New Mexico State University.

Schaefer, William D. (1990, March 7). Much 'Scholarship' on the Humanities is Done Badly and Probably Shouldn't Be Done at All. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, Section 2 B1-B3.

Seldin, Peter and Associates. (1990). *How Administrators Can Improve Teaching*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

Sowell, Thomas. (1992, April 27). Beggars in Tuxedos. *Forbes*, 107.

Sowell, Thomas. (1994, Nov.21). Tenure vs Teaching. *Forbes*, 96.

Task Force on Faculty Evaluation. (1992, February 6). Report to the Kansas Board of Regents.

Terenzini, Patrick T. & Pascarella, Ernest T. (1994, January/February). Living with Myths. *Change*, 28-32.

The Condition of the Professoriate, Attitudes and Trends. (1989). Technical Report, Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

The Malcolm Baldridge National Quality Award, 1995 Education Pilot Program, (1995). Gaithersburg, MD: United State Department of Commerce.

Theall, Michael & Franklin, Jennifer (Editors) (1991, Fall). *Student Ratings of Instruction: Issues for Improving Practice 43*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

Van Schaack, H. & Glick, J.D. (1982). A Qualitative Study of Excellence in Teaching and the Search for Excellence in Teaching. Washington, D.C: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education.

Walters, Laurel Shaper, (1995, February 27). Publish or Perish Becomes Teach or Perish. *The Christian Science Monitor*, 13.

Wright, Delivee L., (Project Facilitator) (1992). From Regard to Reward, How to Proceed: Department to College to Institution. *The Fund for the Improvement of Post Secondary Education*, Lincoln, NE: W.S. Department of Education and The University of Nebraska-Lincoln.

Wright, J., McCormack, S. & Mathews, R. (Co-chairs) (1994). Report of the Committee on Improvement, Evaluation, and Reward for Teaching. Institute for Public Policy and Social Research, Michigan State University.

VIII. APPENDIX

Questions for the Interviews

1. What is good teaching?

2. Are teaching and research complementary faculty functions or do they compete with each other? Explain.

3. If you could choose your *primary* area of professional concentration--teaching or research--which would it be and why?

4. Comment on the current faculty performance evaluation instrument used in your academic unit in the awarding of tenure and/or promotions as well as salary adjustments. Describe the "weighting" given to the different components, as well as the *actual* and *perceived* use of the instrument. How would you change the policies and procedures to bring about an *ideal* system?

5. Would you be supportive of an evaluation system which would recognize and reward faculty in accordance with their professional strengths and interests, their disciplines, and the institution's mission? Or should faculty evaluation practices at all institutions be basically similar to insure quality standardization? Would "customizing" faculty evaluations to the institution and individual faculty members create a "hierarchy professoriate? Discuss.

NOTE

There are inherent limitations in any case study. In the case study reported herein, time did not permit an examination of all relevant issues associated with faculty recognition and reward systems. Further studies, to include such active participants in the evaluation process as students, administrative decision makers and peers are encouraged.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE